The VIRGINIA ARGUS.

No. 69 of Vol. VIII.] A FREE PRESS MAINTAINS THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE. [Whole No. 396.

RICHMOND:—PRINTED (on TUESDAYS AND FRIDAYS) BY SAMUEL PLEASANTS, JUNIOR.

FOUR DOLLARS PER ANNUM—PAID IN ADVANCE] FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19th, 1800. [12½ CENTS SINGLE.

THE subscribers and members of the Mutual Insurance Company, against Fire on Goods and Furniture in the State of Virginia, are hereby requested to attend in person or by proxy, their general annual Meeting, to be held on the second Wednesday in next January, being the fourteenth day of the said month.

W. F. AST,
Principal Agent.

Richmond, Dec. 6, 1800. [w4t

Ten Dollars Reward.

Strayed or stolen, the latter end of July or beginning of August last, from the plantation of major ohn Nelson in the county of Mecklenburg,

A bright bay mare

Got by Old Wildair, which as well as much high blood she plainly shews; 7 or 8 years old, about 4 feet 8 inches high, with a hanging mane and long tail, a few white hairs in her forehead, black legs which are much fluted, the sinews being large and appear very plain, her hind legs very crooked, stand much under her, and bends in her pasterns.

I will give the above reward to have said mare delivered to me here, or to mr Thomas Vaughan in Mecklenburg, or five dollars for such information that may lead to my getting her again.

James Strange.

Richmond, 8th Dec. 1800. w3t

For Sale,

On Monday the 22d day of December next, in the town of Warren, in Albemarle county,

SIXTY PRIME UPLAND

NEGROES,

Consisting chiefly of likely men.—They will be sold for cash, or on credit, as may be agreed between the purchasers and sellers on the day of sale. The sale will be continued from day to day, until the whole are sold.

Just Received,

And for Sale at S. Pleasants' Book-Store,

VIEWS

OF THE
PUBLIC DEBT, RECEIPTS,
& EXPENDITURES
OF THE
UNITED STATES,
BY ALBERT GALLATIN

ALSO,

Hamilton's Letter
TO
President Adams,

Together with his

Amorous Vindication.

Wanted to Purchase,

Five or Six Virginia-born

Male Slaves,

Between ten and fifteen years of age.

Enquire of the printer.

6t *Dec.* 3, 1800.

Gilliat & Kirby,

Have for Sale, a few Pipes and Hogsheads of

LONDON PARTICULAR

Madeira WINE,

OF THE BEST QUALITY.

Richmond, Nov. 24, 1800. (4w)

Just Received,

And for sale by the Printer hereof,

THE

Columbian Reading-Book,

OR

Historical Preceptor:

A collection of authentic histories, anecdotes, characters, &c. &c. calculated to incite in youthful minds a love of virtue, from its intrinsic beauty and a hatred of vice, from its ugliness deformity

---

Notice.

ALL persons having claims on the estate of RICHARD ADAMS, deceased, may have them adjusted and receive payment by applying to the subscriber.—Those who are indebted to said estate, are earnestly requested to come forward and settle their accounts, otherwise they will be prosecuted with the utmost rigor of the law, as it is the wish of the subscriber to close his administration with all possible dispatch.

THE STOCKS OF

Cattle, Horses, Sheep, Hogs, and all the Farming Utensils & crops of Corn, Fodder, &c.

Of the above named estate, will be offered

FOR SALE,

At the times and places following, viz.

On the 10th December, at the plantation near Goochland courthouse, if fair, otherwise the next fair day.

On the 13th December, on the three Forks of the Byrd, in Fluvanna county.

On the 17th December, on the head of Rock Fish River in Amherst county.

On the 22d December, on Calf Pasture River, in Augusta county.

The above property will be sold on a credit of twelve months for all sums exceeding twenty dollars. Bonds with approved security, to carry interest from the date, if not punctually paid, will be required.

JOHN ADAMS, Adm'r.

BY virtue of a Power of Attorney, given to me by the Legatees of Richard Adams, deceased, I will SELL, by private contract,

A tract of Land,

Lying within three miles of Goochland courthouse containing 400 acres, about 150 acres of which are cleared, the balance well timbered. The tract is well watered, and contains a quantity of valuable Meadow. The land will be shewn by Michael Robinson, living on the premises, and the terms may be known by applying to the subscriber.

J. ADAMS.

I will SELL on my own account

A tract of Land,

In New-Kent county, three miles above the court-house, containing near 700 acres, 300 acres of which are cleared, the balance remarkably well timbered. There is an Orchard of upwards of 500 young apple trees, in a situation that never fails to bear. The land is well watered, and is well suited to all the varieties of crops of this climate. One fourth of the purchase money will be expected when possession is given, the balance in equal annual payments.

On the same terms, I will SELL

Four Lots,

In Cumberland Town, New Kent, with a tolerable good dwelling house and two large granaries.

ALSO,

A tract of Land,

Six miles from this city, in Henrico county, containing about 400 acres, the whole of which is covered with the most valuable timber for building.

J. ADAMS.

Richmond, November 19, 1800.

For Sale,

THAT VALUABLE TRACT OF

LAND,

IN the county of Powhatan, whereon I reside, containing between five and six hundred acres, on which are considerable improvements almost new, and suited to the reception of a genteel family.

On this tract of land there is an excellent Merchant Mill, situated on a never failing stream, and in a neighbourhood where the custom is considerable and renders the mill an object; it has been built within these three years past, and is in good order.

The land is suited to the culture of tobacco, corn and small grain, and lies within 22 miles of Richmond, and in an agreeable neighbourhood.—A farther description is deemed unnecessary, as it is presumed any one inclined to purchase, would first view the premises. The terms of payment, &c. which will be made easy and convenient to the purchaser, will be made known by

GEORGE SMITH.

Powhatan, Dec. 2, 1800. 3w

Was brought to the stable of the subscriber on the 23d of last month, by a black man,

A Bay Gelding,

about 4 feet 8 inches high, and supposed to be about 9 or 10 years old. The owner of said gelding is desired to come, prove property and pay charges, or the said gelding will be sold at public sale for his keeping, on the 23d inst.

George Carnoghen.

Richmond, Dec. 9, 1800. 1df

JUST RECEIVED,

From Doct. CHURCH's Dispensary New-York, and for sale at this Printing-Office, a fresh supply of the following

Patent Medicines:

Church's Cough Drops,

A medicine unequalled by any in the world, for the Cure of Coughs, Colds, Asthmas and Consumptions.

Chemical Essence and Extract of Mustard,

For the cure of the Rheumatism, Gout, Rheumatic Gout, Palsy, White Swellings Chilblains, &c &c.

Anodyne Essence,

For the Head Ache.

Volatile Tincture,

For the Tooth Ache.

The Botanical Tea.

Infallible German Corn Plaister,

For the Cure of Corns.

Scotch Ointment

Cures the most inveterate Itch in four hours without Mercury.

Dr. Church's Antibilious Pills,

For the Cure of Malignant and Bilious Fevers, Dyspepsy, Jaundice, Costiveness, Acidity, Cholera Morbus, Gravel, Indigestion, Loss of Appetite, and all disorders of the Head, Stomach, and Bowels.

Eye Salve,

For all disorders of the Eyes.

Antiscorbutic Tincture,

For the Teeth, Breath, and Scurvy in the Gums.

Essence of Scurvy-Grass,

For preventing and curing the Sea and Land Scurvy.

Vermifuge Lozenges,

For destroying Worms in children and grown persons.

Antispasmodic Elixir,

For the cure of all kinds of Fits.

Cordial Restorative Balsam,

For Nervous Disorders, Debility, Inward Weakness, &c.

Vegetable Lotion,

For the face and skin, freckles, sun-burn, prickly heat, Ring Worms, Tetters, &c. &c.

Dec. 10, 1800.

ALSO,

DR. CHURCH'S TREATISE ON THE

Venereal Disorder;

Containing plain and easy Directions for the speedy and effectual cure of that Disease in both Sexes; whereby any person may cure themselves at a small expense. Price half a dollar.

Twenty Dollars Reward.

Ran away last evening, a girl, by the name of

MOLLY;

She is a likely mulatto, upwards of twenty years of age, of middle size, very fond of smoaking, when spoken to has a smiling look—her clothing she will change often I suppose, as she has some variety, and will procure free papers if she should leave Richmond and Manchester. She was raised in the estate of the rev. Price Davies, dec. of Newkent county, and sold to mr John Piemont, who sold her to me. I will give the above reward for bringing her home, and reasonable charges if brought a distance, in addition.

W. Munson.

Manchester, Dec. 9, 1800. (tf)

Joseph Gallego

Has received by the brig Eliza, lately arrived at Norfolk, from Madeira,

A parcel of Choice

LONDON PARTICULAR

Old Madeira WINE,

Which he offers for Sale by the Pipe, Hogshead, Quarter and Half Quarter Cask.

Richmond, Dec. 9, 1800.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Tuesday, December 9.

The House took up the report of the Committee to whom was referred the Memorial of Samuel H. Smith and Thomas Carpenter, desiring admission within the bar to report the debates and proceedings of the House.

The report is in substance—*that it is not expedient that the House should take any order on the memorial presented*

It will be recollected by the reader, that the original motion made was by Mr. Hill, which was that mr. Speaker should be requested to admit the Stenographers within the bar.

Mr Christie moved the reference of the report to a committee of the whole.

Mr. Griswold opposed the reference.

The house divided; for the reference 43; against it 46.

Mr. Jackson made several remarks, which we heard so indistinctly, that justice to him forbids the attempt to report them. He concluded with moving that the yeas and nays be taken; for which purpose a sufficient number of members rose.

Mr Nicholas. In a government like ours, the theory of which is republican, and the practice of which, he hoped, would always continue to be republican, he considered the representatives of the people responsible to the people, by whom they were created. It was necessary to give efficacy to this responsibility that the people, who were to judge, should possess the purest information, as to, not only the acts, but the motives of the public agents. It was of little consequence to them to know what laws are enacted, compared with a knowledge of projects that were attempted or prevented, & the grounds on which they were supported or opposed—Nor could the merit of the acts themselves be understood, unless the reasons for them were stated. It was, therefore, of the highest consequence that the reasons for our conduct should be clearly understood, that our measures may be comprehended, and our motives also known, that our constituents may judge whether we have faithfully discharged our duty.

Under this view of the subject, he tho't it extremely indelicate to resist the admission within the bar of those persons who thought themselves qualified to take the debates and proceedings of the house. But what rendered the attempt still more improper was, its being an innovation on the practice of the house. For since he had been a member of the Legislature, individuals of this description had been placed by the house at their ease, in a situation convenient for hearing what passed. Why is this practice, hitherto unopposed, now to be broken in upon? For such an innovation and departure from the established practice of the house, there ought to be the strongest reasons; particularly when the attempted innovation respected, and was made by, those, whose conduct was to be scrutinised.

It was not without deliberation that the practice of the house had been instituted and adhered to. Some gentlemen had, some time since, contemplated the employment of a particular individual, whose services were to be paid for by the house. But the idea was abandoned, from the supposed sanction given by such an act to his statements; whereby the house might be made responsible for his accuracy and talents.

The difficulty attending the business he acknowledged to be great. But for the reasons he had assigned, he thought the house had acted right in forbearing to interfere, further than by merely assigning a convenient place to the stenographers. It was deemed fittest to confide the business to persons not known officially to the house, whose own individual interest would constitute the best pledge for their fidelity. Though no precise resolve had been passed to this effect, it was well understood that this was the course the house meant to pursue, after having given the subject a deliberate and solemn consideration.

Shall we now, said mr. Nicholas, after this mature consideration, on the mere suggestion of personal inconvenience, on a subject of such importance as to invite a gentleman from a considerable distance, [referring to some old plan] shall we, after the sanction of an uniform practice, fortified by the long period for which it has been observed, on the suggestion of a trifling inconvenience, which, he believed, on examination, would not be found to exist at all, adopt the innovation proposed by the report of the committee? For his part he thought they were all deeply interested in having the debates well taken, as it was not in their power altogether to prohibit their being taken.

He had heard but two objections made to the old plan. The *first* was, that by passing a resolve, admitting the Stenographers within the bar, the house gave a sanction to the reports published by them. The *second* was, that as the Speaker had heretofore had the management of the business, it would be wrong to take it out of his hands.

As to the *first* objection, he thought it altogether incorrect. The resolution, submitted by the gentleman from North-Carolina, (mr. Hill) which he wished the house to adopt, does not propose the selection of any particular person. It admits generally those individuals, who wish to take the debates. Can this admission make us responsible for the conduct of men we do not know, and over whom we have no controul? Have we heretofore been considered as responsible? And wherein consists the difference between our past situation, and the situation we shall be in, if the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina be adopted? We shall then only have done that, which before had been done by the Speaker. Governed by a sense of duty, the Speaker had refused admission within the bar. It became therefore necessary, in order to admit, for the house to pass a resolution. But it did not follow that the least responsibility would arise from such an act.

Indeed by admitting the stenographers within the bar, the responsibility of the House would be diminished; for if the house admitted them, no one could then say that it had done any thing that interfered with a faithful report of the debates; whereas by excluding the stenographers, the unavoidable inaccuracies committed might be charged to the house.

The *second* objection made to the resolution of the gentleman from North-Carolina, was that as the Speaker had heretofore had the management of the business, it would be wrong to take it out of his hands.

Mr. Nicholas, in reply to this objection, observed that the power, heretofore exercised by the Speaker on this subject, had not been expressly delegated to him by the house. It had often been thought of, but no decision had heretofore been made. As the object asked related to the convenience of the members, he thought they were the best judges of the propriety of granting it. The inconvenience alledged to exist was entirely a matter of opinion. He thought it had either no existence or a very limited existence. As he had remarked before the subject was extremely delicate. He would not consent to furnish room for being charged with a wish to suppress the means of making an enquiry into his conduct. He believed that the innovation contended for, would be so viewed—so far, therefore, from considering it as innocent, he viewed it as wrong in itself, and likely to be mischievous in its effects.

Mr. Otis was one of those who was not disposed to make a strong stand against the resolution offered by the gentleman from N. Carolina. He did not view the point in so interesting a light as did the gentleman who had preceded him. It appeared to him in the shape of a question of convenience; and as to his own situation it could not be affected by any permission given to the Stenographers to come within the bar. Many of the arguments he had heard implied that the situation at present occupied by the stenographers was exclusive of all others; whereas if that were inconvenient they might take any other, so that they did not come within the bar.

It is true that the stenographers have hitherto been admitted within the bar. They were admitted because there was room. But in our present chamber the room was less; nor could they occupy a part of that little, without materially interfering with the convenience of the members.

In his opinion the proper question for the house to consider was, whether an admission should take place independent of the speaker, or whether he should decide its propriety. It did not follow, if the Speaker retained the management, that the exclusion would apply to all occasions. It was true that the places, desired by the stenographers, were generally assigned to the high executive officers of the government, and the foreign ministers. But if, in consistence with their accommodation, the indulgence could be granted, during any important debate, he had no doubt of the Speaker's readiness to admit them, and they might thus obtain a temporary place within the bar.

Mr. Otis thought the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia covered too much ground. They ascribed to the friends of the report an attempt to preclude the people from obtaining all information of what passed in this house. No such design existed. For his part he wished the people to know every thing that occurred within these walls. There was no doubt of the debates, as heretofore given, being an inadequate organ of the ideas of the members—they had been taken for nearly twelve years; and sometimes they had been accurate, and at other times terribly inaccurate; and so complete had the distortion of sentiments often been that had it not been for the name that was attached to a particular speech, the member, to whom it was ascribed, would

it to be his. Mr. Otis [illegible] nothing, not deny the ability [illegible] who read the debates to form a [illegible] idea of the arguments used on a particular subject.

The charge of innovation, mr. Otis tho't unjust. He proposed to leave the business as it had heretofore been left, free from any resolve of the house, to the controul of the Speaker. By this conduct no sanction would be given to the performances of any reporter; but, on the other hand, if the house passed a resolve, divesting the Speaker of his previous power, they would render themselves responsible, and would virtually give a sanction.

If it were resolved that the house should interfere, he would much rather select and pay an individual, competent to the business, and appeal, for the faithful discharge of his trust, to his candour and impartiality.

If the house passed the resolution admitting the Stenographers within the bar, mr. Otis asked whether they would not in fact be officers of the house. The only difference between them and the other officers would be that one would be paid, while the others would not.

Mr. Otis said that, in his opinion, the most inconvenient position in the house had been taken by the stenographer. It was near the clerk's office, between which and the bar there was a perpetual passage of the members. If an experiment were made of a position on the other side, or in the upper gallery, he was persuaded it would be found very convenient. Are not, said mr. Otis, the galleries constructed for the express purpose of hearing? Are they not intended for the good people of the United States? And if they can hear in them, cannot the stenographers also?

Mr. Otis concluded by stating the extreme inconvenience that would arise from admitting the stenographers, the interference that it would produce with the assignation of seats to the secretaries of our government and the foreign ministers, and with declaring his opinion that it was most expedient to adopt the report of the Committee.

Mr. Nicholson said, that if he understood the objections made by the Gentleman from Massachusetts to granting an admission of the Stenographers within the bar, they might be all classed under three heads.

1. It would be against precedent.
2. It would prevent the members from having elbow room.
3. There is a possibility that the speaker may indulge the Stenographers.

As to the first objection, he would ask whether the house had not a right to exercise any power themselves that was exercised by the Speaker. Hitherto the Speaker has exercised the power, and admitted the Stenographers within the bar; he now refuses to do it, and we are called upon to perform what he refuses. If we think it proper to admit them we have a right to do it. The power heretofore exercised by the Speaker, was derived from us, according to the well known maxim, *Qui facit per alium, facit per se.*

But, we are told that the admission would interfere with the accommodation of the four Secretaries and the foreign ministers. Suppose it should, said Mr. Nicholson. I ask whether the convenience and the interest of the people of the United States are to be prostrated by our complaisance to the Secretaries and foreign agents? It is our duty to enable the people to obtain the best information of what is doing here, that we can supply. Shall we abandon our duty, shall we sacrifice the interest of our constituents to a sense of politeness to these Gentlemen? It would be much better to submit to the inconvenience experienced by the Secretaries and the foreign ministers, if there is not room for them within the bar, than to conceal from the people the knowledge they have a right to possess. Let, then, the foreign ministers, if there be such a competition, retire into the Galleries.

He considered the subject as of high importance both to the country, and the members themselves. They all ought to desire their conduct to be rigidly inspected.

Gentlemen say that the debates have been heretofore imperfectly taken. Will they remedy the evil by excluding the Stenographers from places within the bar? If, heretofore, notwithstanding the favorableness of their position, when stillness and silence reigned, they have been unable to take the debates with precision, can it be expected that, driven to a distance from most of the members, surrounded by a crowd in perpetual motion, they will be able more successfully to accomplish their object? Sir, said Mr. Nicholson, the expectation is absurd. It cannot be done. I have placed myself without the bar, & I declare it impossible to hear correctly. If, then, you are determined to exclude them from their usual places, you had infinitely better turn them out of the house altogether.

As to the convenience of the galleries for hearing, Mr. Nicholson was not able from a trial made by himself to decide upon it. But he had heard but one uniform opinion, which was that owing to the constant passage of persons and the frequent crowd it would contain, it was impossible to hear there with any distinctness. With respect to the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, on this point, he thought them altogether inapposite. The gallery was not constructed by us, and if it were a bad place for hearing, it arose not from any fault to be ascribed to us. All that we did, was to open our doors to all citizens, who conducted themselves with decorum.

The personal inconvenience to members alledged, did not in the opinion of Mr. Nicholson exist. He thought there was ample room. The chamber they occupied was similar to that in Philadelphia; and the positions desired by the Stenographers were relatively the same as those in Philadelphia. —By advancing the clerk's table three feet, every difficulty would be removed.

Mr. Rutledge said that the members, who had preceded him, had talked much about the necessity of giving the people correct information of the transactions of that house. He believed there was not a single member, who did not wish to impart to the people all the knowledge they could receive, and who did not highly prize the means of information furnished by the proceedings of that house. On this point there was no division. No one was desirous of excluding the Stenographers, or prohibiting the publication of debates. The only question really before the house was, whether they should persevere in the old plan; whether they should confide in the integrity and the talents of the Speaker, who had hitherto merited their confidence, or whether divesting him of his power, they should exercise a right themselves hitherto attached to his office.

Such a mode of procedure as had been pursued on this occasion was not conformable to that heretofore practised. An application somewhat similar had been, some time since, made to the Speaker. The Speaker decided, and the house, without debate, acquiesced in his decision. A Stenographer had grossly misrepresented a member, and when required to correct his false statement, had insolently refused to do it, and added to the previous injury of misstatement insult of the contumelious kind. The speaker dismissed him from his place for this barefaced misconduct. Some of his friends made an appeal to the house. The house acted wisely, and with becoming dignity refused to interpose.

Now, said Mr. Rutledge, if any other stenographer, like the one I have alluded to, shall make it his systematic practice to misrepresent, and he continue, as heretofore, to hold his place at the tenure of the Speaker's permission, he may be dismissed by the Speaker without troubling the house. But should the motion made by the gentleman from North Carolina prevail, we shall be perpetually appealed to, and occupied in debate. For these reasons he trusted the report would be agreed to.

Mr. Hill next spoke for several minutes, what he said was not heard, further than that he declared he considered the subject as simply involving an address to the sentiments of the members on the ground of personal convenience, and that on that ground he was ready to sacrifice any little inconvenience to the accommodation of the stenographers; stating, at the same time, his entire reliance upon the integrity and talents of the Speaker.

Mr. Griswold's introductory remarks were not heard. Having raised his voice, his first words, as heard, were,—This is nothing less than an appeal from the chair. To the Speaker has heretofore been committed the regulation of the admission of all persons whatever within the bar. This is the only correct mode in which such an object can be accomplished. The Speaker must exercise the discretion hitherto vested in him, otherwise the order of the house cannot be preserved. The object is now to take this power from the Speaker, and to open the area of the house to the stenographers, without the Speaker's approbation. It is said that only two persons at present apply. But if the door be once opened to admission in this way there may be no end to intrusion. The Speaker being divested of power to act, and the necessity of acting being evident, the house will be perpetually troubled with appeals.

In his opinion the power, confided to the Speaker, had been exercised in this case with great propriety. It must be apparent to every body that the area was too small to justify the admission of the Stenographers. He believed it to be an idle pretence, that the Stenographers could not hear. He believed it to be a mere matter of pride, which would be gratified by an appeal from the chair and a reversal of the decision of the Speaker by the house.

Mr. Thatcher, persuaded that all the information derived from the debates of this house, was of little comparative importance, when viewed in relation to the general mass of information possessed by the people, cared but little for the event of the resolution before the house. Upon this ground he felt no anxiety whatever. As a matter of order it might perhaps be of some importance. As to the convenience of position, he doubted whether a more correct account of the debates could not be given from a situation from without the bar than within it. His reasons were these. It was well known that for four or five sessions after the organization of the federal government, stenographers never came within the bar; and their positions, during that period, were as remote from the members as they are at present. Yet if any one man would appeal to the debates then taken, he would find them as correctly taken as they have been at any time since. It is true, there were complaints of inaccuracy, but the debate takers never assigned, as a justification of their errors, the inconvenience of their situation; on the contrary they declared that they did as well as they could, and contended that their reports were as correct as the nature of the case permitted.

When the seat of government was transferred to Philadelphia, and the stenographers occupied places within the bar, complaints encreased, the debates were taken more incorrectly, and two or three of the stenographers were actually turned out of the area within the bar; one of whom, he believed was sent into the upper gallery.

The incorrectness of the published debates did not arise so much from an inability to hear as from an inability to take down a rapid speech.

Mr. Thatcher said he believed the debates as taken down by Mr. Lloyd, were as accurately taken, as any taken before or since. The conclusion he drew from these facts was that if the stenographers were admitted by the house within the bar, the public would gain nothing by it. He had however no objection to their admission, if the Speaker approved it. They might as far as he cared, take any place in the house; even seats along side of the Speaker.

Mr Davis had expected to hear substantial reasons in support of the report of the committee. None such had been offered. It was said that the stenographers could hear very well from their present positions. He denied it. The reporter could not possibly hear. Though himself nearer the gentleman he had not heard a word that fell from the gentleman from North Carolina.

He trusted the house would admit the stenographers within the bar. If not admitted, the conversation and passage of the members around them, will at once prevent the debates from being well taken, and be a perpetual excuse for their errors. But if admitted they will have no such apology, and they will be within the power of the house.

The great mass of our citizens are too remote to attend your debates. They rely on those who report them. Not more than forty or fifty persons transiently appear in the galleries, who are not equal to diffusing a knowledge of your proceedings. Exclude the stenographers and you may as well shut your doors. It may be said that you print your journals. But who reads them? They are scarcely red by the members themselves. On great national questions the people ought to know, not only what you do, but also the principles that guide you.

The gentleman from S. Carolina was willing to place the stenographers under the coercion of the Speaker, but was averse to placing them under the coercion of the house. For his part he thought differently. He did not wish to see them at the mercy of the Speaker.

Several allusions had been made to the treatment of a reporter at Philadelphia who had been driven from the house by the Speaker. He recollected the affair, and in his opinion the Speaker had in this case been actuated more by personal enmity, than by any other motive.

Mr H. Lee next rose. He spoke for some time, without our being able to hear him; & through the whole course of his speech we occasionally lost a sentence. He said, he put it upon the candour of his colleague from Virginia to declare, whether in his opinion, any gentleman in that house wished to suppress his sentiments, or was disposed to shrink from an avowal of them. If an individual were to judge from the debate of to-day, he would infer that it was the desire of some members on that floor to conceal their sentiments from the people. No such thing was the case. We are as anxious, as those who differ from us that the people should know what we think, say, and do.

The only question was, whether the Speaker shall exercise a certain power, which he can conveniently, and which he hath hitherto honorably, exercised, or whether we shall assume it with all its inconveniences. He hoped we should not. He feared no inaccuracy so long as the debates published received no sanction from the house.

Have you, said Mr. Lee, no greater objects to engage your attention, than whether this man, or that man shall go out of your bar, or remain within it. He thought the house might be better employed.

Mr. Macon understood the subject before the house very much as his colleague did. The question was simply whether we will take upon ourselves inconveniences alledged to exist, or keep the stenographers without the bar. He was convinced that the situations occupied by the stenographers were badly calculated for hearing, as even within the bar the members could scarcely hear each other.

One reason had great weight with him. It was that if the house made a rule in relation to the admission of the stenographers, it would be placing law in the room of discretion. He ever preferred a certain rule, to a vague discretion.

The danger apprehended from a crowd of Stenographers was farcical. Since he had been in Congress he had never seen more than three or four. And if the number admitted should prove inconvenient it would be time enough, when the inconvenience was experienced, to remedy it.

Mr. S. Smith said, the question was entirely one of convenience. He would not ascribe to any member a desire to suppress his sentiments. The speeches never went forth as delivered. Yet it was desirable to assign to the Stenographers the most convenient places. He had heard Gentlemen on both sides of the chair declare they would experience no inconvenience from the admission of the Stenographers. For himself, from his situation, he could experience none. He believed indeed, that the members could be heard from any part of the house; and nearly as well in one place as in another—But as other Gentlemen hold a different opinion, and the Stenographers had hitherto been admitted within the bar, he had not the least objection, and would vote for their admission.

In this stage of the Debate the Speaker rose, not, he said (the connexion of his words was here lost) —— ——not to enquire into the consequences of the house acting in the business; but again to repeat the line of conduct he had pursued, and the motives that had influenced his conduct; he did this for the information of members not in the house at the time he had before addressed the house. The Speaker then repeated what he had before stated, with some additions; viz. that on being applied to by Mr. Stewart, he had declared to him his decision before any other application had been made; that he had spoke to many members, all of whom without a single exception had approved his ideas; and concluded with again declaring, that the Stenographers could not be admitted within the bar without violating the order of the house, and the convenience of the members. It was, he said, for the house to decide —to them only was he responsible.

Mr. Nicholas understood it to be the object of those who supported the admission of the Stenographers within the bar to place them on a footing, they had heretofore held. This was his object. All the remarks, therefore made, respecting their independence of the chair, were inapplicable. They would still be subject to his control, except as to the single point of situation. In short the business would be restored to its old form.

His colleague had made an appeal to his candor. He wished to know whether he (Mr. Nicholas) thought that he, or any Gentleman in the house, wished to suppress his sentiments, or was disposed to shrink from an avowal of them. He would answer the appeal made by his colleague and would tell him that he did not feel himself at liberty to form conjectures respecting the opinions of others, but decided from facts. If he heard Gentlemen make use of arguments so weak as those which he had heard that day in defence of their sentiments, he would say that their feelings differed essentially from his. He would say that, judging them by their arguments, they do not wish publicity to be given to the Debates of the house.

What does the Gentleman tell us? Does it not amount to this, that their complaisance for the Speaker suffer him to judge for themselves, in a case where they are the best judges; and would not this complaisance go to this length, that if the Speaker should judge wrong, they will not interfere to correct his error?

We are told by a Gentleman just up, that the application made proceeds from pride, and that it can proceed from nothing else. But the gentleman has not assigned his reasons for this extraordinary charge.

It is contended that any place without the bar will be convenient for the Stenographers. Let the place be pointed out. Let the gentlemen who urge this shew us a place without the bar in accessible to the whispers of the members and the pressure of a crowd. Do they imagine that any particular place can be assigned, to which they can ensure a profound silence, and from which every person can be withheld? Do they not know, have they not experienced, that when business presses, when subjects of importance are discussed, a crowd is produced, noise ensues, and interposing obstacles render it impossible either to hear or see the members. In such cases, by far the most interesting that can occur, a recess within the bar can be their only protection.

The Gentleman from Massachusetts had put the business upon a very extraordinary footing, a footing that he did not expect from him. He represented that it would be safe to trust the reporters to the Speaker's indulgence. For his part he did not think it would be safe in such hands. Shall the Speaker have the discretion of saying what debate shall be taken, and what shall not? Shall he, and he only have the public ear? Could the Speaker desire this? Surely he could not. He ought rather to desire the house to decide generally than thus impose upon him such an invidious task.

Mr. Nicholas said he considered those who report the debates as appearing in this house on the behalf of the people of the United States, to whom they communicated what passed here. The people were entitled to this information; and if, as observed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, either foreign ministers, or secretaries, or any other gentleman in long robes, interfered with such an object they ought to give way. He knew not wherein consisted the propriety of assigning them particular seats—what right had they to exclusive seats? He knew no connection that subsisted between them and the house. Be the right as it may, he was not for sacrificing a solid benefit to mere complaisance.

But a gentleman has told us that one Stenographer, for his misrepresentation and insolence, had been discharged by the Speaker. In the course of the debate Mr. Nicholas said, he had studiously avoided any allusion to this circumstance. Nor would he now say any thing about it, as he thought it altogether foreign from the present question.

The respect which gentlemen expressed for the Speaker appeared to him to lead them from the object they professed to have in view. For at present the Stenographers are not under the control of the Speaker. But admit them within the bar, and if they are guilty of misconduct, if they infringe any of the rules of the house, the Speaker has them within his power.

Some gentlemen apprehend the admission of a crowd of Stenographers. The thing is morally impossible. When Congress met in a large populous city where several daily papers were printed, we saw but two reporters. Here, removed from the busy world, where the demand for that description of labour which arose from publishing the debates was not nearly so great, and of consequence the profit less, it could not be expected that there could be more.

Mr. Nicholas concluded by declaring that, in his opinion, it was the duty of the house to decide in this case. The Speaker had changed the established practice of the house. It became the house to enquire whether he had done what he ought to have done, which if he had omitted to do, it devolved on them to see effected.

Mr. Wain spoke in favour of the adoption of the report. The beginning of the speech we were totally unable to hear; nor did we distinctly hear it in its progress. We forbear, therefore, the attempt to report it.

The question was then taken by Yeas and Nays, on agreeing to the report of the select committee, and carried by the CASTING VOTE OF THE SPEAKER.—There being AYES 45, NOES 45.

Statement of facts attending the application of the Editor for permission to occupy a position within the bar of the House of Representatives, that he might be enabled to report with fidelity their proceedings and debates.

—

On the first day of the sitting of Congress, as well as the Editor recollects, he spoke to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and stated that, having been informed that it was usual to obtain his permission to take the debates, the Editor then did himself the pleasure of making a request to that effect.

The Speaker replied that it was usual, and that the permission would be cheerfully granted as a matter of course.

At this period a member came up to the Editor, and asked him how he intended to publish the debates, and whether he designed publishing them at full length. Before the Editor had time to answer the question the Speaker said, addressing himself to the Editor, "You had better not. When the speeches are so long nobody reads them." The Editor replied that he had not prescribed to himself any settled plan, but that he certainly should give all important debates in detail; it was probable that he should abridge those that were not interesting.

At the time it was understood by the Editor, though not expressed in terms, that permission was given by the words of the Speaker, to take the debates in the manner in which they had heretofore been taken, and with the advantages of place which had previously been allowed.

The Editor does not recollect, and he is persuaded that if it had occurred he would recollect it, that the Speaker made any remark whatever respecting any previous application made to him.

As an evidence of the conviction of the Editor that permission was granted to take the debates in the customary way, he need only mention, in addition to what is already stated, that he immediately had made a desk of such a size as to produce the least possible interference with the convenience of the members.

The next morning the desk was taken to the capitol. Previously to placing it within the bar, the Editor again spoke to the Speaker, considering it respectful to consult him respecting the best place for it.

It was then that the Speaker declared his fear that the accommodation requested could not be granted, said that he had been applied to by several other persons, and stated the area to be so small as not to justify the admission.

The Editor assured the Speaker that he felt no desire to incommode the members of the house; that his opinion was that a position within the bar at the windows would not have such an effect; for that as there were four windows, in each of which there was a space that retired within the line of the wall far enough to admit a desk on each side, whereby eight persons might be accommodated, it was evident that no obstacle to the sight or passage of the members would be created by the stenographers.

The Speaker did not repel this suggestion by the expression of any other idea than the one already assigned by him, but said that he had been applied to by a number of individuals, that it was probable more meant to apply; if one was admitted, all must be admitted, and it was utterly impossible to admit the whole.

The Editor replied that he could not answer for the actions of others. But that his own opinion was that there would not be more than two, if so many, stenographers that would steadily attend. He further informed the Speaker, that mr. Stewart, to whose application he had alluded, had told him that he did not mean to publish the debates in detail, but intended to condense them.

The Speaker, without yielding to the idea of the Editor, repeated his conviction of the impossibility of admitting the stenographers within the bar, and stated his opinion that they might hear very well without the bar. The Editor replied unequivocally that, in his opinion, they could not.

The manner of the Speaker impressed the Editor with a hope that his decision was not conclusive, as he said something in reference to his speaking to the members, and expressed a desire that the Editor would try whether he could succeed in hearing outside of the bar.

Under this impression he waved, for several days, any further conversation with the Speaker. In the mean time he consulted a large portion of the members of the house, indiscriminately without reference to political opinion. Of those he consulted, there was not one that did not express a perfect coincidence with the Editor that little, if any, inconvenience could be experienced by the admission of the stenographers; and most of those, on terms of political friendship with the Editor, engaged to speak to him in favor of the application, not entertaining a doubt of succeeding in the accomplishment of the object.

The Editor made use of these means, from an earnest solicitude to gain admission within the bar, without being obliged to resort to the unpleasant expedient of memorializing the house, and from a sincere desire to manifest the highest respect for the Speaker.

The means, made use of, proved ineffectual. For on a personal application to the Speaker, the Editor was informed by him, that on the most deliberate consideration of the request, it could not be granted: *that it was impossible to grant it without destroying the DIGNITY and ORDER of the house, and the CONVENIENCE of the members.*

The memorial offered was forthwith prepared. But before it was presented, the Editor again addressed the Speaker, and informed him that, guided by a sense of duty, he meant to request from the house that permission which he had refused; but still desirous of evincing his respect for the Speaker, he wished to know from him in what way it would be best to present the memorial; stating that if not objected to by him, it would be presented through him to the house. The Speaker said that would be improper, and remarked that the usual way of presenting memorials was through a member. The memorial was accordingly so presented.

—

These facts are thus minutely stated by the Editor, under a conviction that the subject is, not only interesting to him personally considered, but likewise deeply inte[illegible]-